

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action mailed March 1, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, and 14 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on October 6, 2004. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on December 6, 2004. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on March 1, 2005 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein to include additional corrections.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin, et al. in view of Davis III, et al. Independent Claims 1, 9, and 14 recite the limitation of Claims 6 and 12 deemed allowable by the Examiner, namely ". . . [place] an I/O wrapper around the render job and any files accompanying the render job to permit access to said render job and files only by the render job" By contrast, neither the Austin, et al. nor Davis III, et al. patents have any disclosure with respect to placing an I/O wrapper around the render job as provided by the claimed invention. Therefore, Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Austin, et al. - Davis III, et al. combination.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowablity of Claims 6 and 12 if placed into appropriate independent form. As discussed above, the allowable limitation of Claims 6 and 12 have been placed into Independent Claims 1, 9, and 14. Applicant respectfully submits that intervening claim language associated with Claims 6 and 12 is not needed for the claims to be patentably distinct from the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance.

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of \$790.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. \$1.17(e).

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for filing this Request for Continued Examination. Attached herewith is a Notification of Extension of Time with check in support thereof.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

March 28, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073